



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

there be found boards of education and school-faculties ready to adopt it for their classes.—*From the Papyrus.*

Britain's Militarism.

From the Herald of Peace.

BY ROBERT SPENCE WATSON, LL.D.

(The author of this article has been, since the death of Sir Joseph W. Pease, president of the Peace Society, London. He is one of the most experienced arbitrators of labor troubles in England, having been the referee in more than eighty labor-capital controversies.—ED.)

The question as to how far in the present day the cause of peace has made real progress is one which we must consider with anxious care. For "we grow old," and our hearts have often been sickened by the deferring of what seemed reasonable and well-founded hopes. Those of us who remember the opening of the first Crystal Palace in 1851 still recall how it was looked upon and spoken of as the formal opening of the reign of peace, and how, before the year closed, France had received from her traitorous chief the severe blow of the *Coup-d'Etat*, and the gates of the Temple of Janus have never been closed since. Nay, at this very time, the Czar of Russia has called the nations of the world to a second peace conference, apparently forgetful of the terrible wars waged by this country and by his own since the first (from which so much was hoped) was held, and of the war which has raged in his own dominions since the massacre, on January 22, 1905, of unarmed peasants whose crime was the wish to petition him for relief.

And yet few persons will deny that there has been during late years, and that there is now, a strong and growing feeling amongst the peoples of civilized nations (as distinguished, in some cases, from their rulers) in favor of the peaceful settlement of international difficulties. The very wars I have alluded to have fostered and encouraged this feeling by forcibly showing the cruel horrors, the unreasoning madness, and the terrible and unthought of penalties, which accompany strife.

INCREASE OF MILITARISM.

But, strangely enough, in our own land this is the very time when there has sprung up a widely spread movement, which manifests itself in many ways, in favor of new and extensive warlike preparations. In spite of the financial facts, which constantly stare us in the face, that our forces cost us much more for less result than those of any other nation; that our warlike expenditure has increased six-fold in the last half century; that the wars in which we have indulged have wasted the moneys which our own people so greatly need, but have gained for us nothing in prestige, in commerce, in comfort, or security at home; that the flag has proved a wretched trade asset, because trade has never followed it, and no honest and proud nation would desire or dream that it should,—in spite of these facts, we have the constant advice from supposed experts that all we have done in the way of expenditure upon the forces is as nothing to that which we should do. Although we have had constant evidence that to be prepared for war, instead of insuring peace, leads, sooner or later, directly to war, we listen complacently to the apostles of militarism when they preach that the true way to save life is to be prepared to take it upon a sufficiently colossal scale. We are making far too much of our military heroes. It is an error which always precedes the downfall of great

nations. Let us see what we gain or lose by following implicitly the advice of those whose trade is war, and who are indeed skilled in magnifying their office.

APOSTLES OF MILITARISM.

It is interesting to note that though our army has grown more expensive, it has not become more efficient. Our wars have been either with agricultural people, greatly our inferiors numerically, in which case they have at least held their own with us, or with savage tribes whom we have massacred wholesale. But the rewards in money and honors which we have showered upon our generals would have astonished the Duke of Wellington when he had conquered, in countless conflicts and wars lasting through long years, every one of Napoleon's greatest generals, and even defeated the despot of Europe himself. We seem in all things to have lost the sense of proportion now that in every line of life our really great men have left us. But not only so: we now give these unduly exalted heroes a leading place in the councils of the nations, and that not after they have proved their capability to fulfill the necessary duties of legislative administration, but have only indifferently evidenced some knowledge of their own useless and costly trade. It is, as we might expect, the big army officers who are at the bottom of all the military mischief, when, having no killing to do, their idle hands are turned to mischief. They are, in and out of season, always magnifying their office. This is no new thing, but that which is new is the way in which now they are listened to. Their teaching, instead of being received with the caution which should be exercised towards all teaching which has its root in self-interest, is looked upon as inspired. Indeed, it is the only inspiration now all but universally recognized. They urge that every school should become a home of compulsory military instruction; that the young and the older children should alike be taught that the art of killing your fellow-men is the foremost of all. Our universities and university colleges have been seized by this form of plague, and throughout England and Scotland many of them have actually appointed professors of the noble art of self-defense, or, in other words, of legalized murder. What wonder that the still, small voice of the gospel of peace should be silenced by the universal crack of rifle fusilades! We get a new reading of all the worn-out Christian shibboleths: "Lying lips are an abomination unto the Lord," but Lord Wolseley plainly preaches that the soldier's duty is to lay this old-fashioned notion aside. A man cannot be a soldier and obey God so far as truthfulness is concerned; then he must give up God and obey his general. "Love your enemies; do good to them that despitefully use you;" and our daily papers have been filled with admiring notices of General Dragomiroff, who died on the 28th ult., "one of the greatest military authorities in Russia," "the finest tactician in the Russian army." And what were these fine tactics which our journals so much admire, and which not even the least imperial among them condemns? We have his own words for them: "I tell my soldiers to begin fighting the moment the enemy is within reach. Half a dozen volleys will do, then onward with the bayonet, onward, onward; never retreat a step so long as a single enemy is left standing. The bayonet is an excellent weapon. If it is broken, use the butt end of the rifle; if all your weapons are broken, use your

fist, your bread knife, your feet, and, as a last resort, throw yourself upon your foe and *tear him with your teeth.*"

"Love your enemies indeed!" What a babyish and cowardly doctrine compared with this "mellow music" drawn direct from the "Dragons of the Prime which tare each other in their slime."

FROM THE RELIGIOUS STANDPOINT.

But this is surely as serious a state of affairs as any people can be called upon to face. What it really means is that in all matters which affect the nation vitally, the fighting men are to have the supreme say. From the religious point of view this means that the preaching and teaching of Christ are to be set aside, or, at best, kept for Sundays, when the "blind leaders of the blind" will explain that the Master never meant what he took the trouble to say to be understood literally; that had he meant it it would have been bad business, for, if practised, it would simply mean the destruction of those who followed and obeyed his injunctions. It would indeed be excellent for another state of existence, where people would do as they would be done by: that was a state of things which it was pleasant to picture in an after-world — a noble and inspiring ideal. But now and here the notion was too absurd. Why, what should we do with our fleets and armies, what with our policemen? Nay, even our legislatures and lawyers would be superfluous, for each person would be a law unto himself and "esteem others better than himself." So we keep up the image of Christ on our altars, but the gods we worship are Mammon and Moloch.

FROM THE EDUCATION STANDPOINT.

From the point of view of education, again, the fighting man steps to the front. We are members of a world where, rightly or wrongly, competition is the moving force. We need, if we hope to be placed in the race, to have all our people educated, and that to the highest point of which they are capable. But the fighting man says that the first thing for each boy, each student, is to be compelled to learn how to fight. The best way of learning how to kill is the principal thing. Everything must give place to this. We must not trust any other people. In spite of history, in defiance of fact, we are told that unless we are a nation of warriors other peoples will invade us and make us a subject race. Well, we ourselves have, in South Africa, furnished the most recent, almost the only modern example of the possibility of such a course being adopted in the case of civilized nations. But surely the chances of invasion are remote, very remote, phantoms in any event, and, if we devoted a tithe of the time and money to the cause of international peace which we waste over the Services, they would be non-existent. Indeed, this idea of the danger of invasion is at most one of those which represent a possibility which is all but impossible. It is like the stock poser to peace men, "if a man comes to your house and is proceeding to kill your wife and children," and so forth. In the first place, it is some centuries since a serious invasion of Britain was attempted, and the success of the attempt was not encouraging to those who made it. In the second place, it is difficult to conceive a less tempting land for such an attempt, for even were it to be brilliantly successful, the people are not exactly amenable to foreign

dictation. In the third place, if the people insist on our rulers ruling wisely, the skies will fall before any such thing is ever dreamed of. We have it in our own hands. It is quite conceivable that by bounce and bluster, by persistently provoking conduct, by an idiotic "come if you dare" policy, by constantly interfering with the domestic affairs of other peoples, we might succeed in arousing just indignation and wrath which should culminate in the civilized nations of the world combining against us. But we should have first to forfeit all claims to consideration or respect; we should have to sink lower than the unspeakable Turk; it would have to be made clear beyond a scintilla of doubt that we were willfully standing in the way of the world's progress. Surely we are not to mould our education to meet the unsubstantial visions of a clouded brain, even if it be that of a military hero.

CONSCRIPTION.

"There is no alternative to voluntary military training but conscription." Who says so? When did he discover it? How does he prove it? It is the merest and most baseless assumption. At the hands of one or other of the twin branches of the Service we have had wild assumptions of this kind for a century past. We have wasted countless millions of money over one futile fad after another, and after all the Services keep crying, "Give, give." We have gained nothing. According to their own showing, we are no safer now than we were a hundred, fifty, twenty, ten years ago. But the present demand (which is not for voluntary but for compulsory military training) is the most serious of all, for it asks for the children and the youth of the nation; it proposes to interfere with our national education. "Oh, but look at the physical training!" In what is it better than the physical training which has been ours for many generations? Is it because other (often kindred) peoples at times compete successfully against us in rowing, running, football, cricket and the like, that we are to take to shooting? "But see how it mixes classes." Not more or in a healthier way than our hereditary outdoor sports, so long as we always "play the game." "But it won't interfere with education. The boys won't think about it excepting when they are at it. It rather has the tendency to promote a dislike of war." Oh, tell that to the horse marines! Your military heroes are likely preachers of courses which tend to promote a dislike of war. No; if we wish scholars to get an unconscious bias towards any special thing — art, botany, zoology, whatever it may be — we set good pictures, copies of good statuary, beautiful and strange plants, interesting birds, beasts or fishes before them. What the eye sees, what the hand does, becomes part of the scholar, student, man. Then remember our university colleges and the military professors now pitch-forked into them. Remember that our school history books already for the most part are crammed with war and bloodshed, the diseases of the body politic, which are praised as though the man who has had most complaints should have the grandest statue erected in his honor, or nations were to be classed as though high death rate were most worthy of honor. And the military professors are to carry into detail those false views of what a nation's history is, to exalt force above mind, to explain and expound the most approved ways of killing those whom you are told to kill, to show

how man is at his highest when he obeys the laws of nature, although civilization and Christianity alike call upon him to trample them under his feet.

FRUITS OF THE PRACTICE OF WAR.

If we wish to see the fruits of the actual practice of war in individual cases, we have only to go back to that of the Transvaal. Who is there who has not known how campaigning life has ruined the prospects of vast numbers of young and middle-aged men? They have returned home with the ability for steady regular work gone. They can give a brief space of time to it, but then the regularity becomes unbearable, and they throw up their work. And again, the methods of our warfare have either disgusted or they have hardened the men who had to take part in it. How the wickedness of the wholesale devastation of great countries, often indulged in simply to take away the possibility of existence from absolutely innocent people, people who were truly non-combatants, the horrors of the concentration camps thus rendered essential, the destruction of vast quantities of food so as to bring the lever of the starvation of the women and children to bear upon the men fighting for their fatherland, confounded every sense of right or wrong; how the one duty to kill became greater than all the early teaching of the Bible, than the Golden Rule or the Ten Commandments, and how we are learning every day, by constantly increasing deeds of violence, the evil influence of inculcating contempt for human life.

REAL REASON OF THE MOVEMENT.

How comes it that in this country, "this little isle set in the silver sea," there is so strong a movement in favor of militarism, of great defensive military preparations? For those living on the continent of Europe the possibility of invasion is constantly before them. They are divided from their neighbors by slight, often imaginary, boundaries. There are old traditions of quarrels, of invasions, of rectification or alteration of boundaries. Here these do not exist, but the invasion bogey does. I have pointed out one chief reason, that we have given undue weight to the words of those who are, ingrainedly and before all, fighting men. But we have sinned ourselves so greatly in the matters of land grabbing, land hunger, expansion of Empire; we have fought or rather massacred so many weaker people in the process of possessing ourselves of their land; we have so constantly exalted might at the expense of right,—that when two small peoples checked us for three years in the most iniquitous expansion of all, we got a severe shock. We found that others could be as brave and much abler in the exercise of their bravery than we could. We found how we could only hold our own by adopting the most barbarous and uncivilized tactics; that just as the annual cost of our army was out of all proportion to its size, so the exceptional expense of carrying on even so small a war was enormous. We learned that our methods and preparations were so miserable that they invited reckless extravagance, shameful waste, and extraordinary mal-administration. Then we got frightened and, at the precise moment, up sprang the military preachers and declared that without universal military training we were in "a parlous state." No arguments were needed, no facts had to be adduced, the frequent repetition of the parrot cry "universal voluntary training or conscription" was enough.

I do not think that this wild preaching has got such

hold of the working men as of other classes, but they have not yet fully realised that upon them the great bulk of the burden will fall, for it is their children who are to be compelled to learn to do the fighting, to be the rank and file, not officers! They do not seem to have realized that it means little to the rich, less to the foreign parasites who fatten on our body politic. They have apparently not learned the lessons which the Transvaal War teaches. They did the fighting, they pay the bulk of the cost in taxes, and if the demand of moneyed men for Protection be listened to they will have to pay yet more for that direct result of the war. There was no glory for them to get out of such wars, if glory from war is ever worth having. Its creator has got a sadly bedraggled feather in his cap. The foreign millionaires have got and are getting the gold, though our brave British soldiers won it for them by their blood. But, indeed, for the moment, as a people, we have bowed down and worshipped Imperialism with its twin children, Materialism and Militarism, and we find now how far such gods are to be trusted — Materialism destroying all high and noble ideals and beliefs; Militarism ever ready to do the worst behests of those who take the poor materialistic view that money is the principal thing, whilst lives of men, honor, justice, truth, are mere idle words; and Imperialism, which means, and has always meant, the exaltation of force, the grinding of the weak and poor, the prosperity of the few and the poverty and degradation of the many. May the spirit of Peace enlighten the people of our islands whilst there is yet time!

BENSHAM GROVE, GATESHEAD, ENGLAND,
DECEMBER, 1905.

Brotherhood Between Races and Nations.

From a Sermon Preached in Toronto, December 24, 1905.

BY REV. J. T. SUNDERLAND, D.D.

In speaking of brotherhood between races, it is to be observed that progress is perhaps slower here than anywhere else, because the difficulties to be overcome are greatest. The first condition of friendship, or of any feeling that is akin to brotherhood, is acquaintance. People who are strange to us, whose ways are different from our ways, naturally repel us. Charles Lamb, in talking with a friend, referred to a certain man as one whom he hated. "But why do you hate him?" said his friend. "Do you know him?" "Oh, no," replied Lamb, "that is why I hate him." It is because races are usually so widely separated from one another — both in habitat and in race characteristics, as color, form, features, language, mode of dress and manner of living, and therefore strangers to each other — that there is so much race antagonism.

But this antagonism need not be permanent. Knowledge is fast increasing. All parts of the world and all races of men are being brought into closer touch with one another. There is no reason for the continuance of old ignorances, old prejudices, old feuds, old hatreds, old antagonisms. Intimate acquaintance with races shows them all to possess qualities which, in their different ways, are interesting and attractive, and which form a solid basis for mutual friendship, regard and fraternal relations. Indeed, rightly looked at, difference itself has